

Author's response to reviews

Title: Applying psychological theories to evidence-based clinical practice: Identifying factors predictive of managing upper respiratory tract infections without antibiotics.

Authors:

Martin P Eccles (martin.eccles@ncl.ac.uk)
Jeremy M Grimshaw (jgrimshaw@ohri.ca)
Marie Johnston (m.johnston@abdn.ac.uk)
Nick Steen (nick.steen@ncl.ac.uk)
Nigel B Pitts (n.b.pitts@chs.dundee.ac.uk)
Ruth Thomas (r.e.thomas@abdn.ac.uk)
Elizabeth Glidewell (e.glidewell@abdn.ac.uk)
Graeme MacLennan (g.maclennan@abdn.ac.uk)
Debbie Bonetti (d.bonetti@chs.dundee.ac.uk)
Anne Walker (Anne_walker@yahoo.co.uk)

Version: 3 **Date:** 27 June 2007

Author's response to reviews:

Dear Dr Mittman,

Thank you for sending us the copyedited manuscript and the reviewers further comments. The first reviewer had no further comments. The second reviewer suggested four Minor revisions and three discretionary revisions:

Comment. On p. 6, remove the reference to Walker et al's work, as it introduces a model (TPB) without any previous reference to any psychological theory. The authors could mention Walker et al's paper after they've introduced the psychological theories in the immediately following paragraph - saying, in addition, that their own work is an extension of what Walker et al did (using a larger set of theory-driven predictors, rather than just predictors from TPB).

Response. We feel that the referencing of Walker et al's work in the place we have placed it is part of how we introduce theory. We have chosen to leave this unchanged.

Comment. On p.11, re-phrase "question constructs"

Response. 'Multiple question constructs' has been re-written as 'constructs measured with multiple questions'.

Comment. On p. 14, it'd be hugely helpful for the readers to see a summary of the effective predictors across the three outcome measures (and, perhaps, also those that consistently failed to work). Perhaps in bullet-point format, under the heading "Summary of findings"?

Response. Whilst we don't disagree with this comment we are reluctant to

introduce yet more tables to what is already (as the reviewers have acknowledged) a complicated paper.

On p. 17, the % variance explained in the behaviour outcome was 6% and not 7%

Response. We have clarified that our quoting of 6% refers to Table 4 where we are rounding up 5.9%.

Discretionary revisions:

Comment. On p. 11, the sentence "The relationship between II...a post-intentional construct" is unclear - can it be reworded?

Response. We have re-written this as 'Given that Implementation Intention (II) is theorized to act after intention and before behaviour, II is a post-intentional construct and therefore its prediction of intention was not explored.'

Comment. On p. 13, I'm assuming that the sensitivity analysis refers to the analysis of behaviour. If this is true, why not remove it from there and put it in as a footnote? I found it an unnecessary distraction (albeit minor) in the presentation of findings across outcome measures.

Response. In the light of the additional comment from the editor agreeing this was only a minor distraction (and explaining that the journal style does not include footnotes) we have left this unchanged.

Comment. PP. 15-19: I still feel that the Discussion could be more systematic, addressing on the one hand the implications of the findings for changing prescribing practices (i.e., clinical implications) and, on the other hand, the implications for the predictive power and validity of the theories (i.e., conceptual implications). The authors may want to consider the suggestion.

Response. We have introduced two sub-headings to break up the text of the discussion and hopefully signpost to the reader.

We hope the paper is now acceptable for publication,

Yours faithfully,

Martin Eccles